



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,609	07/28/2006	Satoshi Kondo	128875	9512
25944 7590 07/13/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
RAHIM, MONJUR				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2434				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/13/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/587,609

Applicant(s)

KONDO ET AL.

Examiner

MONJOUR RAHIM

Art Unit

2434

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 15, 19-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment and argument filed on **17 April 2009**.
2. **Claims 7, 15, 19-22 remain rejected.**
3. **Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-18 have been cancelled.**
4. **Claims 19-22 are newly added.**
5. **Specification rejection has been withdrawn.**

Responses to the Argument

6. The applicant's arguments filed on **17 April 2009** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the Remarks, the applicant has argued in substance:

Argument (Page 1-2):

(a) *"In response to the rejection of claims 7 and 15, Applicants note that claims 7 and 15 recite that prior to receipt of a program via a network, function information indicating a function used in the program is received. The function information is compared with information stored in a storing unit that determines whether the program is to be received. If it is determined that the program is to be received, then the program is received via a network. If it is determined that the program should not be received, then receipt of the program is canceled. Accordingly, the claimed receiving device, method and computer-readable storage medium prevents communication traffic and security problems resulting from receiving undesired programs. Neither Matsubara nor Grecsek discloses the aforementioned features of independent claims 7 and 15 (as well as newly added claim 22)"*

Response:

Access control policy stored in the system, inherently to compare and determine method used in Grecsek. The method comprises the steps of assessing the software process to determine what capabilities it possesses, maintaining one or more policies which list potential capabilities and corresponding authorizations for one or more contexts, and a unit for comparing the software process capabilities with a policy (please see Grecsek, col 4, lines 14-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, 15, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grecsek Mathew (US Patent No. 6088801), hereinafter Grecsek and in view of Matsubara et al. (US Patent No. 7123914), hereinafter Matsubara.

In regard to ***claim 7***, Grecsek discloses:

- ***registering means for registering information on-on whether a function of a program provided via a network is permitted to be used*** (Grecsek, col 4, lines 14-19);

- ***first receiving means for receiving, before receiving a program, function information indicating a function used in the program*** (Grecsek, col 3, lines 35-38, "A policy contains a list of potential capabilities that process 110 may possess and authorizations indicating which capabilities are acceptable. FIG. 4 illustrates a possible data structure for a policy 200 to store a capabilities list 210 and a corresponding authorizations list 220");

- ***determining means for determining whether to receive a program, by comparing function information received by the first receiving means and information registered by the registering means*** (Grecsek, Abstract);

- ***second receiving means for receiving a program if the determining means determines to receive the program*** (Grecsek, col 2, lines 40-47, "This invention is directed to managing the risk of executing software processes. It is an object of the invention to provide a method for determining the capabilities of a software process before it executes. It is another object of the invention to provide a method for managing access to the resources of a computer using a

capabilities-based policy. Further objects and advantages will become apparent from consideration of the ensuing description");

- *executing means for executing a program received by the second receiving means* (Grecsek, col 3, lines 2-16, "A capability is one or more instructions executed by .. itself be a process. Computer 100 may be any programmable device");

Grecsek does not explicitly teach **networking with relay device**, however in a relevant art Matsubara discloses use of relay device (see Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Matsubara invention modify Grecsek so that network can be monitor or control remotely, Mainly auto reboot.

In regard to **claim 15**, Grecsek discloses:

- *A program for causing a computer to execute: a first step of receiving, before receiving a program, function information indicating a function used in the program* (Grecsek, col 3, lines 2-10), where "sequence is the steps if execution steps, As claimed.

- *a second step of determining, by comparing function information received in the first step and information on whether a function of a received program is permitted to be used, which is pre-registered in memory, whether to receive a program associated with the function information* (Grecsek, col 3, lines 10-13, "Prior to execution, process 110 is simply data and cannot perform any function until executed. Process 110 may be executed directly by the user or indirectly by some other process already executing on computer 100");

- *a third step of receiving a program if it is determined in the second step to receive the program* (Grecsek, col 3, lines 24-27, "An object of the invention is to provide a means for determining the capabilities of process 110 before it executes");

- *a fourth step of executing a program received in the third step* (Grecsek, col 3, lines 2-10, "A capability is one or more instructions executed by a virtual machine 120 on computer 100 to perform a function as might occur in a computer program or interpreted script. If a certain function requires a particular sequence of instructions and process 110 does not contain these instructions then process 110 cannot perform the function. Process 110 is defined by one or more capabilities, each capability being defined by one or more instructions");

Grecsek does not explicitly teach *receiving relay information*, however in a relevant art Matsubara discloses use of relay device (see Abstract and col 2, lines 56-67 and col 3, lines 1-20).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Matsubara invention modify Grecsek so that network can be monitor or control remotely, Mainly auto reboot.

In regard to *claim 19*, claim 7 is incorporated and Grecsek discloses:

- wherein the determining unit further compares the function information received by the first receipt unit and the information stored by the storing unit, and if a function not permitted to be used is not contained in the function information, permits execution of the program (Grecsek, Abstract), wherein compare and determine whether execution permission can be granted.

In regard to *claim 20*, claim 7 is incorporated and Grecsek discloses:

- the storing unit stores information on whether a function of a received program is permitted to be used (Grecsek, Fig. 4), wherein “policy 200” to store the information.
- the function information is information on a function contained in a program to be received (Grecsek, Fig. 1).

In regard to *claim 21*, claim 7 is incorporated and Grecsek discloses:

- the storing unit stores information on whether a resource of a received program is permitted to be accessed (Grecsek, Fig 4).
- And the function information is information on a resource accessed in accordance with a program to be received (Grecsek, Abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 22 is rejected under U.S.C 102(c) as being anticipated by Faillenot et al (US Publication No. 20060101511), hereinafter Faillenot.

In regard to **claim 22**, Faillenot discloses:

- *a first step of receiving, before receiving a program via a network, function information indicating a function used in the program* (Faillenot, paragraph 0005), where "firewall" receive packets and this packet, as claimed.

- *a second step of determining, by comparing function information received in the first step and information on whether a function of a received program is permitted to be used, which is pre-registered in memory, whether to receive the program associated with the function information* (Faillenot, paragraph 0005), wherein filtering the data depending upon rules to determine validity of the data, as claimed.

- *a third step of receiving the program via the network if it is determined in the second step to receive the program* (Faillenot, paragraph 0005)

- *a fourth step of executing the program received in the third step* (Faillenot, paragraph 0005);

- *a fifth step of canceling reception of the program via the network if it is determined in the second step not to receive the program* (Faillenot, paragraph 0005).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (See form "PTO-892 Notice of reference cited).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONJOUR RAHIM whose telephone number is (571)270-3890. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 AM - 3:30 PM (Mo - Th).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz, Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Monjour Rahim/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2434
Date: 07/09/2009

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434